

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

The Design of Pseudo-Participation

Palacin Silva, Maria Victoria

ACM

2020-06

Palacin Silva , M V , Nelimarkka , M , Reynolds-Cu  llar , P & Becker , C 2020 , The Design of Pseudo-Participation . in C del Gaudio , L Parra , S Agid , C Parra , G Poderi , D Duque , L Villezcas , A Botero , F C Londo  o & P Escand  n (eds) , PDC '20 : Proceedings of the 16th Participatory Design Conference 2020 - Participation(s) Otherwise - Volume 2 . ACM , p   New York , pp. 40 44 , 16th Participatory Design Conference PDC2020 otherwise , Manizales , Colombia , 15/06/2020 . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3384772.3385141>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/327096>

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3384772.3385141>

unspecified

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

The Design of Pseudo-Participation

Victoria Palacin
University of Helsinki,
LUT University
victoria.palacin@helsinki.fi

Pedro Reynolds-Cuellar
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
pcuellar@mit.edu

Matti Nelimarkka
University of Helsinki,
Aalto University
matti.nelimarkka@helsinki.fi

Christoph Becker
University of Toronto
christoph.becker@utoronto.ca

ABSTRACT

Participation is key to building an equitable, realistic and democratic future. Yet a lack of agency in decision making and agenda-setting is a growing phenomenon in the design of digital public services. We call this pseudo-participation by and in design. The configuration of digital artifacts and/or processes can provide an illusion of participation but lack supportive processes and affordances to allow meaningful participation to happen. This exploratory paper examines the realm of pseudo-participation in the design of public digital services through two concepts: 1) pseudo-participation *by* design, digital interfaces, and tools that provide the illusion of participation to the people, 2) pseudo-participation *in* design, processes in which those affected by the design decisions are marginalized and not given any agency. We contribute to the re-imagination of participatory design in modern societies where the role of politics has become ubiquitous and is yet to be critically scrutinized by designers.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Applied computing** → **E-government**; • **Human-centered computing** → **Interaction design process and methods**.

KEYWORDS

digital services, technocratic clientelism, pseudo-participation by design, pseudo-participation in design, user configuration

ACM Reference Format:

Victoria Palacin, Matti Nelimarkka, Pedro Reynolds-Cuellar, and Christoph Becker. 2020. The Design of Pseudo-Participation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Participatory Design Conference 2020-Participation(s) Otherwise - Vol. 2 (PDC '20: Vol. 2)*, June 15–20, 2020, Manizales, Colombia. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3384772.3385141>

1 INTRODUCTION

Participatory design has always sought to embrace "change by design" [13]. In these works, change by design often occurs through

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
PDC '20: Vol. 2, June 15–20, 2020, Manizales, Colombia

© 2020 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-7606-8/20/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3384772.3385141>

promoting democratic ideals, improving life for everyone and encouraging positive change [16]. After all, participatory design is rooted in concerns for accountabilities in technology design and power-sharing structures, which traditionally were studied at workplaces [56]. As we are living in the era of participatory culture [12, 20], participatory models have been proposed as a way to address many design issues, ranging from workplace information systems and city planning to environment and social policy issues [1, 32, 54]. Today, participation is often mediated through digital tools, many of which have been designed and/or studied using participatory design lenses [4, 5, 47]. Therefore, the goal of participatory design has been to empower the user both as a designer and as a user of technical artifacts (see Fig 1). However, often these digital services are aimed at consultation and instrumentation as the only forms of participation [37].

	participatory	pseudo-participatory
Participants...		
in ... design	shape the artifacts	have no agency to influence design decisions
by ... design	are empowered by the artifact	have a role that is configured by the artifact

Figure 1: The role of participants in (pseudo-) PD

In the area of digital tools, the importance of participatory design is well understood. The scholarship has shown that values and decisions from positions of power are always embedded into the artifacts [39, 58]. These concerns are also present when we discuss platforms and tools which are designed to support participation. Therefore, to ensure that the aims of accountability and power-sharing are met, it becomes imperative to talk about the power dynamics involved in the creation of civic platforms. For example, municipal websites in Norway have been reported to mostly configure¹ their users as consumers or clients of municipal services—not

¹User configuration refers to the way technologies define/limit people's behaviors

as active citizens with political interests [26]. Through the design and implementation of the website, city officials embedded assumptions about the expected roles of the inhabitants of the city as part of the codebase.

In certain cases, the empowering goals of participatory design are not achieved through its processes. We illustrate such cases in the right-side column of Fig 1. First, it is possible that even when participation is the aim, the role of participants becomes limited throughout the design process. A process can be pre-set by an external agenda and not offer any meaningful power to the people, thus leading to participation without agency. Second, it is possible that a tool that is developed through participatory design processes does not empower its users to exercise meaningful and relevant participation.

Pseudo-participation is used here to refer to *participation without agency* either configured by a designed artifact or within the design process itself.

2 PARTICIPATION, PSEUDO-PARTICIPATION AND DIGITAL POLITICS

Democratic societies strive to embed participation in the direction and operation of political systems in different ways. However, participation has always been a complex concept in practice. Famous examples like the Ladder of Citizen Participation [2], the separation of informative, consultative and discursive interaction [9], different knowledge levels (e.g., [21]), and other typologies of participation and democracy (among many others [15, 22, 27, 36, 46]), show versatility of participation. A participatory initiative may have several aims, not all of which focus on engaging with people. Rather, sometimes the aim is to start a process to only give an impression of real engagement. This is known as technocratic clientelism (*"state-led regime with clientelistic mediation between the state and society"* [19, p.17]) and it is characterized by an appearance of political effectiveness by the creation of participatory processes, where both popular control and people's agency are virtually non-existent [3, 18, 19].

Technocratic clientelism is part of a larger phenomenon of pseudo-participation. Midgley [31] refers to pseudo-participation to define participation aimed at the ratification of decisions already made by external bodies. In participatory budgeting settings, participation might occur without an influence on the outcomes [24, 42]. Pseudo-participation is also a term described in management studies as a mechanism to cultivate an impression of openness but carefully retain decision-making [40]. A similar phenomenon has been documented in social contexts as *"tokenism"*, where the goal is to involve a minority representative to portray an impression of social inclusiveness (e.g. racial diversity) [8].

Research across online deliberation, social media, and politics, as well as social computing scholarship, is actively engaged in the study of ICT-enabled tools that may support democracies [51]. Given the digital nature of these tools, there is a body of research that has addressed both the (1) technical aspects of the digital interfaces (e.g. [14, 61]) as well as (2) social practices which emerge when people interact through digital interfaces (e.g., [17, 48]). However, this type of work often overlooks the well-documented fact that digital interfaces embody particular values, norms, and assumptions [39, 58].

2.1 Pseudo-participation by Design

Academic research and journalism have highlighted the value-laden nature of digital tools and their construction, for example by exposing algorithmic biases [6, 7, 41] and demonstrating how people can find themselves exposed as a result of media malinformation, misinformation, disinformation, and polarization [11, 38, 44]. For example, during the 2019 elections in Finland, a public debate emerged about an algorithm implemented in a voting advice application. This demonstrated the increased public attention to the construction of digital interfaces and their politics [28].

Pseudo-participation by design emerges through the interaction with a configured artifact (i.e. digital service) that creates an impression of affecting change through digital interaction. In reality, these artifact's affordances have been pre-set by an agenda and do not offer any meaningful power to the people. They configure the role of the user (e.g. information consumer) and limit the ways they can interact with the tools. Enabling digital participation without giving any real agency. This augments an existing lack of transparency in institutionalized participatory processes. In them the main focus is to collect as many opinions as possible as opposed to opening-up the mechanisms in play during all decision making stages.

Power relates to the opportunity to reconfigure users' roles in digital services. Pseudo-participation by design hurts the willingness to participate, reduces trust in government, and diminishes the ability to create social capital. Through the design and implementation of an artifact (e.g. a website), city officials can embed assumptions about what are the expected roles of the inhabitants of the city [26]. Some instances of pseudo-participation by design are:

2.1.1 *Pre-set agendas.* can be observed in online consultations (e.g. web surveys) where residents are involved in a consultative manner only at the last stages of decision making. For instance, a city launches a survey to ask residents to choose a color for the new buses in their city without giving the opportunity to deliberate on whether there should be new routes or other approaches to solving their traffic issues [52]. However, this type of pseudo-participation by design can also be observed by pre-set options in questionnaires. For example, in a city survey, people are given the option to choose which is the most important area to improve in their city from three pre-selected options (see table 1).

Which of the following do you think is most important in developing the municipality of ...?
1) Independent municipality: zoning, new construction sites, development of downtown and villages.
2) Business development: bioenergy, local food, tourism
3) Culture and Nature as Promoters of Well-Being: A Cultural City, Developing a Culture of Well-Being

Table 1: Exemplary of survey of city priorities (source [33])

2.2 Pseudo-participation in Design

Participatory design from its start has sought to democratize technology creation by opening up design and computing to those who will be affected by the artifacts [25]. However, this promise can sometimes fall short. Participatory design processes can result in limited involvement by those who will be affected by design decisions. Most typically, this manifests as introducing people's participation purely as an instrument - for example, incentivizing residents to report potholes in the city through a city website - and constraining other forms of participation. This phenomenon is what we call pseudo-participation in design.

The power of making decisions about technologies for public use manifests also in the processes of design. Although many claim to be using participatory approaches such as participatory design or co-creation when designing digital services, but in reality, often those affected by the design decisions are marginalized and not involved in the design decisions loop [19]. The quality of popular control in pseudo participatory processes is very low [19]. Some instances of pseudo-participation in the design are:

2.2.1 Participatory budgeting. has become a popular approach to involve people in the process of deciding how an allocated part of the public budget is spent. Since the 1980s when Porto Alegre implemented participatory budgeting [30, p.24], hundreds of cities across the planet have also implemented it. Currently, Portugal is aiming to scale it nationally for the first time in history. Cities like Paris have complemented participatory budgeting platforms with coordinated offline meet-ups with people to reduce the digital divide effects of the platform. Indeed, participatory budgeting is a process, not a product [29]. However, some implementations of participatory budgeting have become forms of pseudo-participation by design, when these processes are used as a way to legitimize budget cuts or to exclude certain groups [43, 50, 57]. For example, Bodin [19] documented how in Santa Cruz, Bolivia their participatory budgeting process gives no genuine control to the people. Technical experts control major decisions and political operatives control minor street-level decisions. People have little agency or control over the decisions. Only non-budgetary issues are subject to popular control, for example, the question where projects decreed from above should go. Indigenous populations and regime opposition are systematically excluded from the process. Furthermore, they are counted as supporters/non-supporters on the initiatives regardless of whether this is true or not. Despite these issues, the local government has managed to create an appearance of institutional effectiveness: the city's budgetary execution rate has been amongst the highest in Bolivia, yet the link between popular demands and city actions is quite limited and often non-existent.

2.2.2 Naming competitions. became quite popular during the last decade. The idea is simple: A public consultation over the name of something is open, and everyone can submit an idea. The idea with the most votes wins. This was seen as a way to give power to people over something small. Often, people would use these platforms to have fun and submit imaginative names. It is telling that in instances where the citizens' choices are not considered "appropriate" by those in power, even these little pockets of choice are dismissed after the fact. Most famously perhaps, the British

natural environment research council launched an online poll to name a major research vessel in 2016. The public overwhelmingly voted for "Boaty McBoatface". But the results of the vote were not followed, and the ship ultimately received another name [23].

2.2.3 Smart cities. are built with data, often crowdsourced by the residents. In the mainstream discourse on smart cities, data are often upheld as a neutral authority and not scrutinized, when in reality, they are highly contextual, collected with a purpose, and almost never guaranteed to be unbiased [10]. More and more cities across the world are prioritizing data capture and analysis as a means of informing policy development [35]. These models of technocratic governance claim to empower people through open, transparent information [34, 35]. However, in this model, governments treat people as instruments for data collection that provide information about something (e.g. potholes) in the hope of gaining better city services in the future. Cities make policies based on the data collected through this type of process.

When people aim to take a position and create datasets that reflect their lived experiences, and these counter the city's representation, the data is often regarded as flawed and limited and may even be disregarded entirely from the policymaking process [49]. Yet, any dataset is inherently biased. For instance, Shelton describes a case where a neighborhood in the US launched a community mapping initiative. Their goal was to map vacant properties using pen, papers and on-the-ground deployments to dispute the city's records and a basis for policy. The initiative gathered more contextual data than the city had available, including immediate spatial context, third party liens, and ownership. City policies would not allow counter data to be used in decision making.

3 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Whether in the design process or through the designed artifact, the nature of participation in design is bounded by the materiality and socio-technical contexts of the participation approach. Many concerns about participation are familiar to those working on participatory designs. Focusing the attention on the concept of pseudo-participation may create a productive space for a critical analysis of participation in a variety of contexts. We, therefore, suggest to ask:

3.0.1 How does technology configure participants? There is a long tradition of examining technology and politics [39, 58], as well as concerns about how users are configured through technologies [59]. However, we have not engaged the question of how specific kinds of configurations take place through participatory technology. For example, if participants' role is to respond exclusively to multiple-choice questions about predefined issues, and not to deliberate, then they can be described as a data source in the participatory process, not an active designer choosing how the data is used (see Fig 2).

3.0.2 To pseudo-participate or not to participate? Why do people take part in pseudo-participation? Even though from a narrow utilitarian viewpoint, voters have little incentive to vote since their vote on its own has minimal impact, people do in fact vote [45]. Riker explains that there is some level of civic duty that people seek to fulfill when they vote. Similarly, in the case of pseudo-participation, it may be that those participating acknowledge their

participants are...	in PD	in pseudo-PD
in design	designer	data source
by design	decision maker	data collector

Figure 2: Configuration of participant roles in pseudo-participation vs real participation

limited abilities to influence formal decision-making process. People who create petitions in the UK acknowledge that those are not likely to change government policy [60] but seek to participate through this channel anyway. A research agenda in pseudo-participation could be to understand the experience of pseudo-participation and potential benefits emerging from those experiences.

3.0.3 Pseudo-participation in a wider socio-cultural system. Pseudo-participation highlights how important exploring participation not only through tools but in a wider context is. It is not sufficient that a tool supports participation, but rather they need a supportive process as well [55]. The case of Boaty McBoatface shows how even when technology allows detailed participation, the process might fail. We highlight how technology solutions created in a participatory process should not only enable people's participation in design but should be co-owned by everyone, hence the benefits should be equitable [53]. The breadth of this concept is yet to be explored in light of social, geopolitical and economic factors. These aspects may significantly influence ways in which pseudo-participation is embedded in socio-technical systems.

This paper explores the concept of pseudo-participation and illustrated it with examples that showed how pseudo-participation manifests. We distinguish two forms: (1) pseudo-participation *in design* configures participants' agency in the design process in a way that relegates them to the role of a data source without decision power. (2) Pseudo-participation *by design* manifests through systems that facilitate a specific form of participation in which participants are configured into narrow roles of data collectors. Recognizing these narrowing visions of participation can be a starting point to initiate a conversation about emancipation and empowerment in the service of truly participatory design approaches and services.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was partially supported by the Canadian Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council through RGPIN-2016-06640.

REFERENCES

- [1] Leo G Anthopoulos, Panagiotis Siozos, and Ioannis A Tsoukalas. 2007. Applying participatory design and collaboration in digital public services for discovering and re-designing e-Government services. *Government Information Quarterly* 24, 2 (2007), 353–376.
- [2] Sherry R Arnstein. 1969. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planner* 35, 4 (1969), 216–224.
- [3] Eri Bertsou and Giulia Pastorella. 2017. Technocratic attitudes: a citizens' perspective of expert decision-making. *West European Politics* 40, 2 (2017), 430–458.
- [4] Alan Borning, Batya Friedman, and P Kahn. 2004. Designing for human values in an urban simulation system: Value sensitive design and participatory design. In *Proceedings From the Eighth Biennial Participatory Design Conference*.
- [5] Margot Brereton and Jacob Buur. 2008. New challenges for design participation in the era of ubiquitous computing. *Co-Design* 4, 2 (2008), 101–113.
- [6] Meredith Broussard. 2018. *Artificial unintelligence: how computers misunderstand the world*. MIT Press.
- [7] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*. 77–91.
- [8] Helen Carter. 2002. Minorities accuse TV and radio of tokenism | Media | The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2002/nov/12/radio.raceintheuk>. (Accessed on 03/15/2020).
- [9] Andrew Chadwick and Christopher May. 2003. Interaction between States and Citizens in the Age of the Internet: "e-Government" in the United States, Britain, and the European Union. *Governance* 16, 2 (2003), 271–300.
- [10] Manuela Ekowo. 2016. Why Numbers can be Neutral but Data Can't. <https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/numbers-can-neutral-data-cant/>. (Accessed on 11/01/2019).
- [11] Robert Faris, Hal Roberts, Bruce Etling, Nikki Bourassa, Ethan Zuckerman, and Yochai Benkler. 2017. Partisanship, propaganda, and disinformation: Online media and the 2016 US presidential election. *Berkman Klein Center Research Publication* 6 (2017).
- [12] Gerhard Fischer. 2011. Understanding, Fostering, and Supporting Cultures of Participation. *interactions* 18, 3 (5 2011), 42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1962438.1962450>
- [13] Alexandre Apsan Frediani, MA Fench, and I Nunez Ferrera. 2011. Change by Design: Building Communities Through Participatory Design.
- [14] Deen Freelon. 2018. Computational Research in the Post-API Age. *Political Communication* 35, 4 (2018), 665–668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1477506>
- [15] Archon Fung. 2006. Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review* 66, s1 (12 2006), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>
- [16] Naska Goagoses, Asnath Paula Kambunga, and Heike Winschiers-Theophilus. 2018. Enhancing commitment to participatory design initiatives. In *Proceedings of the 15th Participatory Design Conference: Short Papers, Situated Actions, Workshops and Tutorial-Volume 2*. ACM, 14.
- [17] Todd Graham. 2012. Beyond "Political" Communicative Spaces: Talking Politics on the Wife Swap Discussion Forum. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 9, 1 (2012), 31–45.
- [18] Seán Hanley. 2018. Legitimacy and the paradox of technocratic government in newer European democracies: the Fischer administration in the Czech Republic revisited. *East European Politics and Societies* 32, 1 (2018), 78–100.
- [19] Gabriel Bodin Hetland. 2015. *Making Democracy Real: Participatory Governance in Urban Latin America*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- [20] Henry Jenkins, Mizuko Ito, and danah boyd. 2015. *Participatory culture in a networked era: A conversation on youth, learning, commerce, and politics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [21] Anne Marie Kanstrup and Ellen Christiansen. 2005. Model power: still an issue?. In *Proceedings of the 4th decennial conference on Critical computing: between sense and sensibility*. 165–168.
- [22] Christopher Keltz, Aaron Panofsky, Morgan Currie, Roderic Crooks, Seth Erickson, Patricia Garcia, Michael Wartenbe, and Stacy Wood. 2015. Seven Dimensions of Contemporary Participation Disentangled. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 66, 3 (3 2015), 474–488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23202>
- [23] Sarah Knapton. 2016. 'BoatyMcBoatface' to live on as yellow submarine, science minister Jo Johnson announces. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/2016/05/06/boatymcboatface-to-live-on-as-yellow-submarine-science-minister/>. (Accessed on 12/03/2019).
- [24] Theresa Libby. 1999. The influence of voice and explanation on performance in a participative budgeting setting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 24, 2 (1999), 125–137.
- [25] Silvia Lindtner and Cindy Lin. 2017. Making and its promises. *CoDesign* 13, 2 (2017), 70–82.
- [26] Lucia Liste and Knut H Sørensen. 2015. Consumer, client or citizen? How Norwegian local governments domesticate website technology and configure their users. *Information, Communication & Society* 18, 7 (7 2015), 733–746. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.993678>
- [27] Christoph Lutz and Christian Pieter Hoffmann. 2017. The dark side of online participation: exploring non-, passive and negative participation. *Information Communication and Society* 20, 6 (2017), 876–897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1293129>

- [28] Esa Mäkinen. 2019. HS muutti vaalikoneen suosituksia: uusi algoritmi avattuna ja selitettyä - Poliitiikka | HS.fi. <https://www.hs.fi/politiikka/art-200006039563.html>. (Accessed on 12/03/2019).
- [29] Curtis William McCord. 2016. *Making Digital Polity Spaces: Encoding Democracy into Information Systems*. Master's thesis. University of Toronto. <http://hdl.handle.net/1807/75357>
- [30] Justin McGuirk. 2014. *Radical cities: across Latin America in search of a new architecture*. Verso Trade.
- [31] James Midgley et al. 1986. Community participation: history, concepts and controversies. *Community participation, social development and the state* (1986), 13–44.
- [32] Michael J. Muller. 2007. Participatory Design. In *Human-Computer Interaction*, Andrew Sears and Julie A. Jacko (Eds.). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420088892>
- [33] Hailuoto Municipality. 2019. Kysely: Kysely Hailuodon kunnan vakituksille ja vapaa-ajan asukkaalle - Otakantaa.fi. <https://www.otakantaa.fi/fi/hankkeet/384/osallistuminen/717/kysely/>. (Accessed on 12/02/2019).
- [34] T. Nam. 2015. Challenges and Concerns of Open Government: A Case of Government 3.0 in Korea. *Social Science Computer Review* 33, 5 (2015), 556–570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439314560848>
- [35] Taewoo Nam and Theresa A Pardo. 2011. Smart city as urban innovation: Focusing on management, policy, and context. In *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on theory and practice of electronic governance*. ACM, 185–194.
- [36] Matti Nelimarkka. 2019. A Review of Research on Participation in Democratic Decision-Making Presented at SIGCHI Conferences. Toward an Improved Trading Zone Between Political Science and HCI. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 3, CSCW (11 2019), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359241>
- [37] Matti Nelimarkka. 2019. A Review of Research on Participation in Democratic Decision-Making Presented at SIGCHI Conferences. Toward an Improved Trading Zone Between Political Science and HCI. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 139.
- [38] Matti Nelimarkka, Salla-Maaria Laaksonen, and Bryan Semaan. 2018. Social Media Is Polarized, Social Media Is Polarized: Towards a New Design Agenda for Mitigating Polarization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, 957–970.
- [39] Helen Nissenbaum. 2005. Values in Technical Design. In *Encyclopedia of Science, Technology, and Ethics*, Carl Mitcham (Ed.). MacMillan, New York, lxvi–lxx.
- [40] A Dictionary of Human Resource Management. 2020. Pseudo-participation - Oxford Reference. <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100352217>. (Accessed on 03/14/2020).
- [41] Cathy O'Neill. 2016. Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. *Nueva York, NY: Crown Publishing Group* (2016).
- [42] W Pasewark and R Welker. 1990. A Vroom-Yetton evaluation of subordinate participation in budgetary decision making. *Journal of Management Accounting Research* 2, 1 (1990), 13–126.
- [43] Michael Petite. 2014. *Participation and Praxis: A Study of How Participatory Budgeting Deepens Democracy by Institutionalizing Critical Consciousness*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Carleton University.
- [44] Markus Prior. 2013. Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science* 16 (2013), 101–127.
- [45] William H. Riker and Peter C. Ordeshook. 1968. A Theory of the Calculus of Voting. *American Political Science Review* 62, 1 (1968), 25–42. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055400000125
- [46] Gene Rowe and Lynn J Frever. 2005. A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms. *Science, Technology & Human Values* 30, 2 (2005), 251–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243904271724>
- [47] Joanna Saad-Sulonen, Eva Eriksson, Kim Halskov, Helena Karasti, and John Vines. 2018. Unfolding participation over time: temporal lenses in participatory design. *CoDesign* 14, 1 (2018), 4–16.
- [48] Bryan C. Semaan, Scott P Robertson, Sara Douglas, and Misa Maruyama. 2014. Social media supporting political deliberation across multiple public spheres. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social computing - CSCW '14*. ACM Press, New York, New York, USA, 1409–1421. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2531602.2531605>
- [49] Taylor Shelton, Matthew Zook, and Alan Wiig. 2015. The 'actually existing smart city'. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 8, 1 (2015), 13–25.
- [50] Yves Sintomer, Carsten Herzberg, and Anja Röcke. 2008. Participatory budgeting in Europe: potentials and challenges. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32, 1 (2008), 164–178.
- [51] Graham Smith. 2009. *Democratic innovations: Designing institutions for citizen participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- [52] Elli Sormunen. 2019. Lappeenranta-aikeat haluavat pinkit bussit katukuvaan - pinkki keräsi lähes puolet yleisöäänestyksen äänistä | Yle Uutiset | yle.fi. <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11031996>. (Accessed on 03/13/2020).
- [53] Fiona Ssozi-Mugarura, Edwin Blake, and Ulrike Rivett. 2017. Codesigning with communities to support rural water management in Uganda. *CoDesign* 13, 2 (2017), 110–126.
- [54] Nathalie Stembert and Ingrid J Mulder. 2013. Love your city! An interactive platform empowering citizens to turn the public domain into a participatory domain. In *International Conference Using ICT, Social Media and Mobile Technologies to Foster Self-Organisation in Urban and Neighbourhood Governance, Delft, The Netherlands, 16-17 May 2013*.
- [55] Jennifer Stromer-Galley. 2004. Interactivity-as-Product and Interactivity-as-Process. *The Information Society* 20, 5 (11 2004), 391–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240490508081>
- [56] Lucy Suchman. 2002. Located accountabilities in technology production. *Scandinavian journal of information systems* 14, 2 (2002), 7.
- [57] Rutiana Dwi Wahyunengseh. 2016. Inclusion-Elitist Paradox in Participatory Public Budgeting A Case Study on Surakarta City, Central Java, Indonesia. In *2016 International Conference on Public Management*. Atlantis Press.
- [58] Langdon Winner. 1985. Do artifacts have politics? In *The social shaping of technology*, Donald MacKenzie and Judy Wajcman (Eds.). Open University Press, Buckingham, 26–38.
- [59] Steve Woolgar. 1990. Configuring the user: the case of usability trials. *The Sociological Review* 38, 1_suppl (1990), 58–99.
- [60] Scott Wright. 2015. 'Success' and online political participation: The case of Downing Street E-petitions. *Information, Communication & Society* 4462, October (9 2015), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1080285>
- [61] Scott Wright and John Street. 2007. Democracy, Deliberation and Design: the Case of Online Discussion Forums. *New Media & Society* 9, 5 (10 2007), 849–869. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807081230>